

Remarks

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application.

The indication that claims 2, 8 and 13 are directed to allowable subject matter is greatly appreciated.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Jaskolski (US 5,274,332).

Claims 1-15 remain in the application unamended.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 USC 102(b).

More specifically, **Claim 1** is directed to a split-top RF coil for use in magnetic resonance imaging comprising: a first housing having a first RF coil portion disposed therein; a second housing having a second RF coil portion disposed therein; a plurality of slides disposed on at least one of the first and second housings; and a plurality of slide tracks disposed on at least one of the first and second housings such that said tracks are opposite from the slides, the tracks for receiving the slides for mechanically coupling the first and second housings.

Jaskolski, on the other hand, is directed to a radiofrequency coil which includes a lower coil support assembly 55 comprises one half of a longitudinally cut cylinder having installed therein one of the coil circuits 39 of the coil illustrated in FIG. 3a and rests on the complementarily shaped upper surface of cradle 41. The upper coil support assembly comprises the other half of the cylinder which has installed therein the second coil circuit 38. In use, upper coil assembly 56 is removed while the patient is being positioned in the lower assembly. Proper alignment between the upper and lower coil assemblies is achieved by means of alignment pins 57A provided in the lower coil assembly which engage openings 57B provided in the upper coil assembly. See *Jaskolski*, column 6, lines 20-33.

In light of the above, it is clear that Jaskolski teaches alignment between housings via the use of pins and openings (shown as circular holes) rather than a plurality of slides disposed on at least one of the first and second housings; and a plurality of slide tracks disposed on at least one of the first and second housings such that said tracks are opposite from the slides, the tracks for receiving the slides for mechanically coupling the first and second housings as set forth in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

The foregoing remarks above in connection with claim 1 can be applied *mutatis mutandis* to independent **claims 6 and 12**. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claim 6 and 12.

The remaining claims depend from claims 1, 6, or 12. For at least the reasons set forth above in connection with the patentability of the base independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that **claims 2-5, 7-11 and 13-15** are patentable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-15 distinguish patentably and non-obviously over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. An early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

If any fees are due in connection with this Response A, the authorization to charge deposit account 14-1270 for the fees associated therewith is hereby provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas M. Lundin
Reg. No. 48,979
Philips Intellectual Property and Standards
595 Miner Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44143
T: 440-483-4281
F: 440-483-2452